

Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JAMMR_89442  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Rapid Ultrasound in Shock and Hypotension (RUSH) in blunt polytrauma patients |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

PART 1: Review Comments

|                                     | Reviewer's comment   | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>In my opinion, this paper will be an important addition to the literature. There are some points that I believe should be revised. I have put my remarks as notes on the manuscript file as there were no line numbers on the pages. Overall, I believe the manuscript should be checked for English language use and for grammatical errors. The authors cite some articles multiple times in the results section. There are major articles on this topic, it will be much better if the authors also compared their results with the rest of the world. Some major points are; the manuscript lacks an ethical approval number. Also, my remark about Table 1 should be clearly explained.</p> <p>Table 1: I don't understand how is it possible that the "Site of the trauma" section sums up to 100% when these patients are multiple-trauma patients? This looks quite controversial.</p> <p>Table 4: What is the golden standard method for these diagnoses? The sensitivity and specificity of each test are missing. The design of the table is flawed.</p> | Noted and corrected   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |  |   |

PART 2:

|  | Reviewer's comment  | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |